



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,522	01/29/2004	Steven N. Roc	007404-000547	5541
41577	7590	11/06/2007	EXAMINER	
WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY, MCNETT & HENRY LLP			LLOYD, EMILY M	
111 MONUMENT CIRCLE, SUITE 3700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-5137			3736	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/06/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@uspatent.com
GMercer@uspatent.com
Karla.Dirks@Roche.com

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/767,522	ROE ET AL.
	Examiner Emily M. Lloyd	Art Unit 3736

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Emily M. Lloyd. (3) Charles Schmal.

(2) Max Hindenburg. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 32, 33, 47, 50, and two proposed new claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 6143164 (Heller et al.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant explained the benefits of the flexible sheet to the cost, manufacturing, and accuracy of the invention. The Applicant stated that Heller et al.'s material appears to be a sponge-type material instead of a sheet, and doesn't mention flexibility. The Applicant also expressed confusion about the 112 2nd paragraph rejections in the previous office action. The Examiner explained that the 112 2nd paragraph rejections were based on the claims not clearly expressing if the sheet extended distally of the capillary channel, and that the proposed claim revisions overcame this rejection but did not specify that the sheet was proximal the end of the capillary channel. The Examiner also noted that the sorbent material of Heller et al. appeared to have different shapes in different embodiments of Heller et al., including a flat shape in Figure 6. The Examiner also noted that the materials listed in Heller et al. for the sorbent material were flexible.